



# Meeting Summary

## Upper San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

**October 6, 2009, 9:00 am – 2:15 pm**

**Location: Merced County Farm Bureau  
646 South Highway 59  
Merced, California 95340**

### WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
Randall Anthony	Merced Irrigation District	Member
Margit Aramburu	University of the Pacific, Natural Resources Institute	Member
Leo Capuchino	City of Mendota	Member
Dario Dominguez	County of Madera	Member
Sarge Green	CA Water Institute, CSU Fresno	Member
Richard Harmon	Landowner/Grower, Dos Palos, Calif.	Member
Reggie Hill	Lower San Joaquin Levee District	Member
Dave Koehler	San Joaquin River Parkway and Cons. Trust	Member
Kellie Jacobs	County of Merced	Member
Mari Martin	Resource Management Coalition	Member
Paul Romero	CA Department of Water Resources, Flood Plain Management Division	Member
John Shelton	CA Department of Fish and Game	Member
Ken Kirby	Kirby Consulting Group	CVFMP* Executive Sponsor
Merritt Rice	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO**
Roger Lee	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO**
Yung-Hsin Sun	MWH Americas Inc.	Consultant Program Manager
Eric Clyde	MWH Americas Inc.	Technical Lead
Alexa La Plante	MWH Americas Inc	Team
Austin McInerny	Center for Collaborative Policy	Facilitator
Ben Gettleman	Kearns & West	Facilitation Support / Note Taker

\* Central Valley Flood Management Planning

\*\*Central Valley Flood Planning Office

### Absent:

Julia Berry	Madera Farm Bureau	Member
Jerry Lakeman	Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District	Member

## Meeting Summary: Upper San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

Bill Luce	Friant Water Authority	Member
Diana Westmoreland Pedrozo	Merced County Farm Bureau	Member
Jose Ramirez	City of Firebaugh	Member
Monty Schmitt	Natural Resources Defense Council	Member
John Slater	County of Madera, Resource Management Agency	Member
David van Rijn	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Member
Douglas Welch	Chowchilla Water District	Member

### Observers:

Steve Sadler	Kings River Conservation District
Pal Hegedus	RBF Consulting

### WORK GROUP HOMEWORK/ACTION ITEMS

1. Provide additional comments on materials discussed in Meeting #4 by October 15, 2009:
  - Problems and Opportunities Working Draft Summary
  - Draft CVFPP Goals and Principles
2. Review and provide comments on the following sections by October 15, 2009:
  - Section 2.3 – Existing Resource Conditions
  - Section 2.4 – Likely Future Conditions
3. Review Chapter 3 Problems and Opportunities when available
4. Brainstorm on Draft Objectives (Draft CVFPP Goals, Principles, and Objectives) for in-depth discussion during Meeting #5

Homework assignments should be sent to DWR lead Brian Smith, [besmith@water.ca.gov](mailto:besmith@water.ca.gov) with a copy to MWH lead Eric Clyde, [Eric.S.Clyde@us.mwhglobal.com](mailto:Eric.S.Clyde@us.mwhglobal.com).

### ACTION ITEMS: PROGRAM TEAM

1. Yung-Hsin Sun, MWH, will send a copy of the Merced County Board of Supervisors PowerPoint presentation (October 7, 2009) to work group members.
2. Ben Gettleman, Kearns & West, will send work group members the list of currently scheduled city and county board and staff meetings.
3. Yung-Hsin Sun will investigate joint LAFCO/Board of Supervisors meeting taking place at Tenaya Lodge.
4. Eric Clyde, MWH, will develop criteria for data collection.
5. Roger Lee, DWR, will provide instructions to sign up for the FloodSafe distribution list.
6. Roger Lee will provide an internet link to DWR's Third Draft of Interim Levee Design Criteria.
7. Facilitation team will identify meeting locations for Meetings #5, #6, and #7 as soon as possible.

### GROUP RECAP (meeting highlights for use by Work Group partners in their communications)

The Upper San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group (Work Group) of the CVFMP Program continued its work on October 6, 2009 with the following actions:

- Reviewed and provided comments on synthesized Problems and Opportunities statements.
- Reviewed and provided comments on CVFPP Goals and Principles.
- Reviewed CVFPP Legislative Requirements.

## Meeting Summary: Upper San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

The Work Group's purpose is the development of content for the RCSR, a key component for developing the 2012 CVFPP. The RCSR will identify resources, conditions within the Central Valley, flood management and related problems and opportunities, and goals and objectives for use in preparing the CVFPP. The Upper San Joaquin Work Group is one of five regional work groups in the Central Valley.

### MEETING GOALS

1. Clarify the 2012 CVFPP report structure and content
2. Address issues raised in Meeting #3
3. Provide roadmap of remaining meetings – process, content, document
4. Provide status updates on Topic Work Groups
5. Continue refinement of Problem and Opportunity Statements (Chapter 3)
6. Introduce and begin work on Goals and Objectives (Chapter 4)

### SUMMARY

#### Welcome and Greetings

Roger Lee, DWR, and Austin McInerney, meeting facilitator, welcomed the work group participants. Austin McInerney reviewed the meeting purpose, goals and agenda.

#### Opening Remarks

Ken Kirby, CVFPP Executive Sponsor, welcomed the group and provided opening remarks. Mr. Kirby also reviewed with the group the *Responses to Questions from Meetings #2 and #3* document. Key comments and follow-up questions during the group discussion included:

- **Question #4** – Systems approach to CVFPP development and responsibility for action

Q: Work group members have the responsibility to report back to the people in their counties. There are some places in the state where the state does provide assurances. Is there language or mapping available to define this?

A: The planning team is hoping to release a working draft in November 2009.

Q: What portion of the Prop 1E funding has already been spent, and how much funding will be available for areas where the state does not provide assurances?

A: There is a summary of the money that is left and how it will be spent in the next 10 years. Most of the money from Prop 1E was dedicated for the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC) facilities. There are grants available for non-project levees and study grants available for local agencies.

Q: Are you confident that the criteria are adequate?

A: Yes, the criteria have been identified to the 200-year level of protection. DWR has a third draft of Interim Levee Design Criteria that is available on the FloodSAFE website.

Comment: It would be helpful to know the criteria to make sure we are integrating with other projects.

Response: We will make those guidelines available.

- **Question #6** – Plan for environmental documentation

Comment: As DWR develops the strategy and EIR related to the plan, it should also work on a strategy for best management practices for levee maintenance. Endangered species is another important issue, and cities and counties would benefit from some guidance.

Comment 2: Most projects don't include long-term maintenance guidance.

Response: DWR plans to help develop a system-wide maintenance approach for project levees.

## Meeting Summary: Upper San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

- **Question #10** - Update regarding compliance requirements of local jurisdiction

Ken Kirby reported that that planning team had started briefings with local agencies and elected officials to provide an update on the CVFPP development process and to provide an overview of the new land use requirements that will be included in the plan. Yung-Hsin Sun added that the planning team would be presenting at the upcoming LAFCO Conference at Tenaya Lodge.

Q: Are the briefings in memo format to share with the Work Group?

A: The planning team has developed a PowerPoint presentation that can be shared when it is finalized.

Q: Will there be presentations to the Board of Supervisors?

A: The planning team will be meeting with Supervisor Max Rodriguez October 7th and will be presenting to the Merced Board of Supervisors on Thursday, October 8th. The CVFPP outreach team is calling all representatives to make sure they are aware of the project and its requirements.

Q: Can you please send out a notice when the planning team is presenting to boards in our area?

A: Yes.

Comment: The San Joaquin Board of Supervisors meets at Tenaya Lodge in October. The planning team could present at the meeting and inform all of the supervisors at one time.

Comment 2: This could be combined with the LAFCO Conference presentation.

- **Question #13** – Detailed data collections for management action development

Q: Are the criteria for data collection available?

A: Nothing is currently available, but this can be provided in the future. The planning team can provide a list of data collection items for work group members.

### Review of Meeting #3 Action Items

Roger Lee reviewed the list of action items from Meeting #3 and provided updates:

1. Gary Hester will schedule meeting to address boundary issue on the southern edge of the Upper San Joaquin region.

**Status:** The meeting took place, and the boundary issue will be handled outside of the work group moving forward.

2. Eric Clyde will remove Dry Creek from the DWR flood control map.

**Status:** Dry Creek was not on the map originally; Eric Clyde checked and verified this.

3. Merritt Rice, DWR, will work with David van Rijn to establish internet link to USACE Comprehensive Study Interim Report.

**Status:** The link is available, but it does not work consistently. The planning team is working to post the study on the SharePoint website. In the mean time, work group members can request a copy on CD from Roger Lee ([rlee@water.ca.gov](mailto:rlee@water.ca.gov)).

4. Merritt Rice will create a summary narrative on westside streams.

**Status:** A narrative was not written, but Merritt Rice is coordinating to make sure an analysis is done.

5. Brian Smith will provide a summary of DWR flood mapping that has happened since the 1997 flood and Pal Hegedus will present on the status of current mapping efforts at next meeting.

**Status:** Paul Romero, DWR, provided a summary of flood mapping that has happened since 1997. Pal Hegedus presented on the status of current mapping efforts.

## Meeting Summary: Upper San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

### Overview of Roadmap and Topic Work Group Progress

Eric Clyde, MWH, presented on the group timeline and the CVFPP development process. He also provided an update on topic work group progress.

Highlights of the presentation and group discussion included:

- The original timeline has changed and instead of 10 meetings there will be 7 meetings. The Draft RCSR will be ready for meeting #6 and should be completed by meeting #7.
- This is still the beginning of the planning process. The planning team welcomes work group member participation throughout the process if they would like to remain involved.
- The topic work groups should be completed by the end of October 2009, except for the Agriculture Group. The planning team has begun incorporating input from the topic work groups into the RCSR.
- There will be more topic work groups in the future. The next work groups will begin at the same time as the Valley-wide Forum (Jan/Feb 2010).
- The configuration of the groups will change depending on the focus. The work groups might focus on smaller regions or watersheds once the planning process moves to potential solution sets. The next big focus will be putting together potential management actions and coupling them with potential goals and objectives.
- Comment: The key management action issues are going to be institutional and financial. This will likely be the subject of a future work group.  
Response: We may address this issue in a smaller group. The planning process should define options for management actions before addressing financial issues.
- There is an effort to define a cost approach with the DWR. The “ability to pay” in terms of cost sharing is a challenge.

### Synthesized Problems and Opportunities Statements

Eric Clyde gave a PowerPoint presentation on *Problems and Opportunities Statements*.

Meeting facilitator Austin McInerney introduced the following questions to consider when reviewing the list of problems and opportunities:

1. Does the matrix reflect your input?
2. Do the categories make sense?
3. Are any major problems missing?
4. Are the problems in the correct categories?
5. Are the ratings appropriate?

Q: Are these categories linked to the mission of the study? How were they derived?

A: All of the problems and opportunities are related to integrated flood management, which is the mission of the study. These problems are all related to improving integrated flood management in the Central Valley.

Q: How were these categories identified?

A: The technical leads developed the categories. Input from the topic work groups was also considered.

Input and questions on Problems and Opportunities follow:

Comment: For #5 and #6, part of the system-wide problem is that the basic numbers we started with were underestimated.

Response: This is captured in 5b.

Q: How did you come up with circles and half circles? Did you influence it from a technical perspective?

A: It was based on a synthesis of what we experienced in the work groups. These are draft and we expect there to be changes. This is meant to be a starting place.

## Meeting Summary: Upper San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

Q: For #5, will this process review the accuracy of the designated floodway maps?

A: The planning team is compiling the maps, but it's not clear how far we they will get in reviewing the maps in this round.

Comment: These statements do not currently address designated floodways.

Response: You are correct, none of the problem statement address designated floodway maps.

Q: Should a problem statement be added then?

A: Insert as 5d, "Changes in designated floodways."

Comment: For #2, there is nothing on the integrity of construction materials or design deficiencies.

Comment 2: It also does not mention lack of levee design.

Response: #5a and #5c are intended to cover that. #2 is intended to capture the mode of failure and how it's being compromised.

Comment: There are some places where we made mistakes in developing the flood protection system. In some instances we try to push the system further than it should go (e.g., narrow levees). Our initial design parameters were incorrect. I'm not sure where this should go, possibly in #1.

Response: #5a is intended to capture that concept.

Comment: For #3, add "3d Subsidence."

Q: What is #5c getting at? Is this geologic?

A: This represents the geotechnical analysis that was done on the urban levee program. We know this is a problem.

Q: In Category V, does floodplain water banking fit?

A: This is a solution, and these will be identified in management actions.

Comment: For #7, structures inside the channel sometimes create problems. They seemed like a good idea at the time, but not now.

Comment: For #8, add "#8f (see Comment3 also) changes in natural hydrologic and geomorphic processes."

Response: #9b attempts to capture that.

Comment2: Not all changes have been due to the flood system.

Comment3: Create #8f, "Change in natural processes."

Comment: For #6, there is no mention of projects not being completed because of changes in environmental restrictions.

Response: That is covered in #10a.

Comment: For #8, add "#8g Incompatible land use choices" as a new subtopic.

Q: For #9, do we want to keep the word "negatively"?

A: The negative affects get at the problem, so yes.

Comment: Perhaps we should use "unintended negative" instead.

Comment 2: Sometimes policy-makers have to make hard decisions, so it's not always unintended negative consequences.

Q: Is #14bii based on physical or economic?

A: It is both.

Comment: For #16, some watersheds have source materials.

Response: That is captured in #16b.

Comment: For #20, add local individual responsibility near the flood plain and lack of knowledge of what to do. There is a public education component for citizens and local agencies.

## Meeting Summary: Upper San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

Response: Insert “acceptable behaviors in the flood plain” as a new subtopic.

Comment: For #19, add “#19g Environmental restoration” as a new subtopic.

Comment: For #18, the mechanism isn’t there to manage this mentality.

Response: #4 is intended to capture the coordination.

Response: Add “notification of flood operations” as a subtopic to #18.

Comment: For #10a, add “priorities among different agencies” to the list.

Q: We have mobile homes within the flood plain. How will that be addressed?

A: Public information is part of it. This is also captured in land use.

Comment: For Category VII, there can be information overload when purchasing a property (i.e. new homeowners). Sometimes information needs to be consolidated and packaged to be easily understood.

Comment: For #10d, add “and strategic planning.”

Comment: For #10 add “lack of trust” as a new subtopic.

### CVFPP Goals, Principles, Legal Requirements and Objectives

Eric Clyde gave a PowerPoint presentation on *Goals, Principles, Legal Requirements and Objectives*. He clarified that during meeting #4 the group would review goals and principles and also discuss legal requirement. The group would cover objectives during meeting #5. Mr. Clyde added that the group’s input on these topics would be incorporated into Chapter 4 of the RCSR – Goals and Objectives.

Input and questions on Goals and Principles follow:

Q: Who is the “Board”?

A: This refers to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board. The Board will receive the draft plan and will have six months to review and revise the plan before it is finalized.

Q: For Principles #2, what authority does the board have to integrate land use planning?

A: The principle of integration comes with the implementation of the plan. This plan will define broad principles, but land use decisions will be made locally.

Q: Who do these principles apply to?

A: Everything that comes out of the plan will direct DWR, and that impacts its funding. The new legislation requires local land use agencies to adopt relevant information from the plan into their general plans. They will have two years after the plan is adopted to update their general plans and one more year to update their zoning codes.

Comment: The plan is an unfunded mandate.

Comment: For Principle #4, I don’t think we want to do that. The natural process is to flood the valley

Response: It is a matter of degree.

Comment 2: We have created a system to be static, and our maintenance costs are very expensive because of it.

Response: The corresponding goal can be used to modify the principle.

Comment: The reconstruction of non-natural structures will have to happen, and this is not covered. It should be stated that man-made features are important to maintain.

Response: Goal #1 is intended to cover this. The goal of the study is to find ways of making the system more compatible with natural processes. We need to reduce the burden of maintenance. The goals statements need to be balanced.

Comment 2: We should careful about inserting this because there are facilities that are appropriate, and you don’t want to add capital costs to this.

Response: For Goal #1 insert “using structural and non-structural approaches” after “flood protection.”



## Meeting Summary: Upper San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

Q: How does this affect urbanizing areas?

A: Communities will have to demonstrate 200-year flood protection in order to develop in an area. The state also has required DWR to develop a plan to help communities reach this goal. This was passed in 2007 and goes into effect upon adoption of the CVFPP (by 2015).

Comment: We shouldn't take these principles out of context, but these goals seem to capture the various issues that are being considered. The principles as they stand now are not very good; they should be able to stand alone.

Comment: There should be a new principle added: "Any flood recovery strategy should correspond and correlate with long-term, system-wide goals for flood protection."

Q: Is climate change referred to here the adopted state definition?

A: Yes. The two primary things that have been identified are potential sea level rise and the change in runoff patterns from the snow pack could change peak flows in the system. DWR has done estimates on changes in the flows. The science is not there yet, and we are currently focusing on the scoping element of the plan. When we get to evaluation methods, we will look at specific numbers.

Comment: There should be a new principle added: "promote/enhance education for agencies and the general public for flood issues."

Comment 2: People will appreciate information about risk, but you need public education to convince them to spend money on it.

Comment: The principle "Leverage state investments..." is too broad. "Design and build..." is also broad. There is specificity on the environmental statements, but when it comes to infrastructure it is too vague. For the "Design and build" principle, insert "infrastructure."

Comment: Not clear what the "Promote and fund regional planning" principle means.

Comment: Locally we have to pay for the costs to maintain these facilities. We are being out-priced.

Comment 2: If you plan on a regional basis, the people who make the planning decisions need to contend with that.

Response: Add "and implementation" to "Promote and fund regional planning."

Response 2: The state is willing to participate as a regional partner in the planning process. This is not intended to force anyone to do anything. The plan is intending to find ways to improve integrated flood management. The state may be able to help fund planning to create multi-benefit projects. If an agency wants to build a single-purpose structure, that is fine, but it will have to pay for it itself. If it makes the project multi-objective, then the state will be able to help.

Comment 3: Regional planning isn't the problem, it's part of the solution. If you use regional planning, you have more partners to work with. If you don't include partners in the initial planning process, you're not going to get them later on down the road.

Q: Is the scope of this program to take this to the planning step, or implement as well?

A: The 2012 version is designed to create the framework for a broad, supported vision. DWR is also funding projects now. All of this should lead towards implementation, but another level will be required to actually construct (i.e., feasibility, environmental). The real opportunity of this plan is that we can develop good ideas that will be broadly supported and help communities implement projects they want.

Comment: Why is the principle "Provide equitable access to decision process" needed?

Response: We want to make this explicit.

Comment: Where is the concept of using flood control to support water supply incorporated?

A: In principle #3.



## Meeting Summary: Upper San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

### **Action Item Review**

Facilitator Austin McNerny reviewed the action items for meeting #4. He also reviewed the meeting #4 goals, and the group verified that the goals were accomplished.

Ken Kirby thanked the group for their participation.